DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 433 RC 008 562

TITLE	Rural Development: Information and Technical Assistance Delivered by the Department of Agriculture in Fiscal Year 1971. A Report to the Congress.
INSTITUTION	Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	1 Sep 71
NOTE	62p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Annual Reports; Committees; Community Development; Community Services; Cooperatives; Environmental Influences; *Federal Aid; Health; Housing; Industrialization; *Information Services; Land Grant Universities; Manpower Development; Organizations (Groups); Recreation; *Rural Development; Rural Extension; *Technical Assistance; Tourism
IDENTIFIERS	*Department of Agriculture; Rural Development Committee; USDA

ABSTRACT

As the first part of a four part report to the U.S. Congress pursuant to Title IX, Section 901 of the Agricultural Act of 1970, this second annual report is limited to rural development activities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) delivery system (the USDA National Rural Development Committee, State Rural Development Committee, and county committees). Presented via statistical and narrative summaries and exemplary activities in various States, this report discusses each of the following major program thrusts: leadership and overall community development; comprehensive planning; community services and facilities; housing; health and welfare; manpower development; recreation and tourism; environmental protection; business and industrial development and rural cooperatives. Also presented are total efforts of the land-grant universities which involve training professional personnel for leadership, conducting research, and extending knowledge beyond the university to the populace. Discussion relative to committee membership, organization, and activity scope is supported by tabular displays relative to 1971 State and substate rural development committee composition, major activity involvement, and man-years of USDA rural development information and technical assistance. Names and addresses of USDA rural development committee chairmen are appended. (JC)

ED107433

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

file

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Information and Technical Assistance Delivered by the Department of Agriculture in Fiscal Year 1971

A Report to the Congress
As Requested by Title IX, Section 901(d)
of the Agricultural Act of 1970

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RC008562

ED
0002

PRESIDENT NIXON

"The revitalization of rural America is one of the important objectives of my administration. For I am convinced that the growth which this Nation will inevitably experience in the coming decades will be healthy growth only if it is balanced growth -- and this means growth which is distributed among both urban and rural areas."

SECRETARY HARDIN

"I ask each agency in the Department to give aggressive leadership and assistance to the rural development program. Our goal is to utilize our existing authorities to provide more jobs and income opportunities, improve rural living conditions, and enrich the cultural life of rural America."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

"The Congress commits itself to a sound balance between rural and urban America. The Congress considers this balance so essential to the peace, prosperity, and welfare of all our citizens that the highest priority must be given to the revitalization and development of rural areas."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250

September 1, 1971

Honorable Spiro T. Agnew
President of the Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Mr. President:

Honorable Carl Albert
Speaker of the House of Representatives
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Mr. Speaker:

As required by Title IX, Section 901(d) of the Agriculture Act of 1970, I am transmitting herewith the report of the Department of Agriculture reflecting our efforts in fiscal year 1971, to provide information and technical assistance to rural areas.

The report clearly portrays the rapidly accelerating activities of the Department and its cooperators in dealing with the complex problems of rural areas. During fiscal year 1971, the Department devoted some 3,200 man-years to providing information and technical assistance to local communities and development groups. More than 107,000 assists to different groups and/or specific projects were involved.

In May 1971, a series of national conferences brought the members of the State Rural Development Committees of the 50 States and Puerto Rico together to discuss progress and problems. The evidence of progress in this second year of Rural Development Committee operation is most encouraging. Most committees have established close liaison with their State Governor's office. In 14 States, the Governor has established a statewide rural development council or cabinet.

To achieve the goals we have set for the revitalization of rural America, we still have a long way to go but now that we are mobilizing our resources, now that the impeding problems are being recognized and analyzed and the leaders at all levels aroused to action, we can look forward to even greater progress in the coming year and years immediately beyond.

Sincerely,

Clifford M. Hardin

CLIFFORD M. HARDIN
Secretary

CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY HIGHLIGHTS	1
INTRODUCTION	3
Responding to Needs	4
USDA'S DELIVERY SYSTEM	5
Rural Development Committees	5
Assistance Provided by the Land-Grant Universities	9
STATISTICAL SUMMARY	11
PROGRAM THRUSTS	15
Leadership and Overall Rural Development	16
Comprehensive Planning	21
Water, Sewer, and Solid Waste Disposal	24
Recreation and Tourism	27
Environmental Protection	29
Health and Welfare	33
Housing	35
Business and Industrial Development	39
Manpower Development - Job Training and Education	42
Development of Rural Cooperatives	45
Electric and Telephone Development	48
APPENDIX	50

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Composition of State and Substate RD Committees, FY 1971 . . . 7

Table 2 - Man-Years of Rural Development Information and Technical Assistance Delivered by USDA, FY 1971 12

Table 3 - Rural Development Technical Assistance Delivered by USDA, FY 1971 13

Table 4 - Rural Development Information Delivered by USDA, FY 1971 . . . 14

SUMMARY HIGHLIGHTS

The USDA committed over 3,200 man-years and provided approximately 107,000 assists to different groups and organizations for rural development in FY 1971, in the Department's efforts to bring about social, economic and cultural progress and produce a more balanced growth in this nation.

This second annual report is in accordance with Title IX, Section 901(d) of the Agricultural Act of 1970 which states that the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress each year, a report reflecting the efforts of the Department of Agriculture to provide information and technical assistance to small communities and less populated areas in regard to rural development. The report also must include the technical assistance provided by Land-Grant Colleges and universities, through the Extension Service, and other programs of the United States Department of Agriculture.

USDA's delivery system includes its 50 State Rural Development Committees and 2,274 area and county committees along with county, State, and national offices that provide this unique and unparalled system that delivers not only USDA program assistance but assists other Federal and State agencies in program delivery.

Assistance was rendered to rural areas through conducting an estimated 89,000 workshops, conferences and meetings and 22,265 surveys and feasibilities studies. These were attended by key community leaders, public officials and other interested citizens seeking help in finding solutions to their pressing community problems. In addition, more than 10,000 different bulletins, newsletters, and fact sheets were prepared and more than 4.3 million copies were distributed. Some 188,000 radio and 25,000 TV broadcasts, announcements, and spots were prepared to assist in resolving the problems of rural America.

Significant accomplishments were made in eleven concentrated program areas or thrusts. These thrusts include leadership and overall rural development; water, sewer, and solid waste disposal; environmental protection; comprehensive planning; recreation and tourism; housing; business and industry development; health and welfare; development of rural cooperatives; rural electric and telephone development; manpower training and education.

For example in rural housing, 24 States and their Rural Development Committees placed particular emphasis on this need. It is noted that 145 man-years were devoted to solving housing problems in the nation by USDA and Extension employees. Housing assists to individuals were 21,875. Some 4,567 communities were assisted. USDA employees conducted 14,752 meetings and produced 1,357 surveys during the past year. Similar accomplishments are reported for each of the program thrust areas.

Included in each program thrust area was the efforts provided by the Land-Grant universities. The Land-Grant universities, in helping citizens, voluntary groups and public policy-making bodies, enhanced the process of Rural Development during fiscal year 1971. This was a three-pronged role of training professional personnel to serve as leaders, conducting research to discover knowledge, new products and new ways of solving problems, and extending knowledge from the university campus to the citizens of the State.

This report is limited to rural development activities and therefore does not include the technical assistance provided for agricultural production and marketing, and for the construction, maintenance and service of housing, community facilities, water control structures and like projects. The report also does not indicate the budgetary emphasis being placed on rural development by the Department of Agriculture. For example, funding of USDA principal rural development programs in FY 1972 is estimated at more than 4 times the FY 1961 level ($2,668,000,000 vs. $575,000,000) and 2 times the FY 1969 level ($2,668,000,000 vs. $1,369,000,000). Financial assistance is reported in other Title IX reports.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT -- INFORMATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE DELIVERED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FISCAL YEAR 1971

INTRODUCTION

The steady flow of resources from rural America to the urban centers during the past century has produced a nation with 70 percent of its population living on 2 percent of the land. In contrast, the rural or non-metropolitan areas, which account for about 90 percent of the land, have one-third of the population, 60 percent of the substandard housing, and receive only one-fourth of the personal income. During the 1960's farm population declined by an average of 5 percent annually, and 74 percent of all rural counties had a net outmigration. The continued flow has not been a matter of choice. It's a product of a technological revolution in agriculture which, while providing for the best and most efficiently fed nation in the world, has displaced millions of workers without providing them alternative opportunities in rural America.

The depopulation of rural America and the amassing of millions more in a few huge metropolitan areas have created tremendous problems for both rural and urban America -- poverty, crime, congestion, pollution, and exorbitant social costs in cities; and inadequate health, education, and manpower programs, insufficient job opportunities, low-quality housing, and forced migration of young people from rural areas.

The development of rural America can contribute to the solution of both of these problems, as is emphasized in Title IX, Sec. (a) of the Agricultural Act of 1970, which states "The Congress commits itself to a sound balance between rural and urban America. The Congress considers this balance so essential to the peace, prosperity, and welfare of all our citizens that the highest priority must be given to the revitalization and development of rural areas."

State and local governments and local leaders are finding it increasingly difficult to deal with the complex problems of crime, congestion, pollution and high social costs in the cities; and inadequate health, education and manpower services, insufficient job opportunities and dilapidated housing in rural areas. However, there is an emerging national policy to put more of the decision-making responsibility for dealing with such problems in the hands of local government and local people.

With this added responsibility and the growing complexities of community problems, an involved and well-informed citizenry is essential if rural America is to prosper and contribute to balanced growth nationally. The further development of rural America can contribute to the solution of both the rural and urban problems.

Rural America is at a distinct disadvantage in coping with these increasingly complex problems. Most rural communities cannot employ officials who devote full time to their growth and development. Most have limited technical expertise necessary to obtain State and Federal assistance. And most have only modest comprehensive planning programs.

It is not surprising, then, that the local leaders and officials throughout the nation are asking that the Department of Agriculture, including the State Cooperative Extension Services, help them resolve their community problems in the same way that the Department has helped the farm, the firm, and the family resolve their individual problems in the past. They are seeking information and technical assistance to help them mobilize their leadership, more clearly define their problems, understand the alternative solutions to these problems, and make decisions and take actions to accomplish their objectives. Through this process, the community can become a better place to live, work, and raise a family.

Responding to Needs

The Department is firmly committed to responding to these needs of local communities. In the spirit of President Lincoln who in his fourth message to Congress called USDA "The People's Department," the emphasis in rural development is on helping people to help themselves. The policy is spelled out in Secretary's Memorandum 1667, "Rural Development Program," issued November 7, 1969. It states that "Development is the responsibility of local organizations, groups, and leaders. They provide the means through which the services of governmental agencies and professional personnel can be of assistance. The extent to which people are helped in improving rural living conditions will depend largely on the quality of educational and technical assistance and other services provided by local professional personnel. In assisting the local individuals and groups, local staff will (1) support and guide local leadership in determining the direction for development of its community, (2) provide appropriate help to local groups in carrying out their development plans, and (3) assist local leaders to establish appropriate liaison with other agencies and organizations, both public and private, who can contribute to the development of their communities.

At the national level, overall Rural Development activities of the Department are headed by a Deputy Under Secretary for Rural Development and a Rural Development Committee consisting of the Administrators and Deputies of the Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration, Extension Service, Rural Electrification Administration, Economic Research Service, and Farmer Cooperative Service. The Deputy Under Secretary works with Department and other Federal agencies to help people in the nation's towns and small cities improve their job opportunities and living conditions. He also works with Federal, State, and local officials and private groups to improve community development policy and to help local leaders make better use of Federal development program. The committee develops Department policies, programs, and priorities, and coordinates agency action on matters pertaining to rural development.

USDA'S DELIVERY SYSTEM

Each agency in the Department has been instructed to give aggressive leadership and assistance to rural development. This charge has been accepted and agency efforts are being facilitated and coordinated through USDA Rural Development Committees at the national, State, and local levels. Through these committees and the network of agency offices USDA, including Extension, personnel are actively involved in Rural Development efforts in virtually every county in the Nation. These professionals working in the local community on a continuing basis understand the needs of the community and are in an excellent position to respond to them. They have access to the available resource back-up of their State and national offices and a wide range of expertise from the Land-Grant colleges and universities. In many States they have also closely involved other State and Federal agencies in their Rural Development Committees and network of resource back-up. The Department's delivery system for providing information and technical assistance is unparalleled.

Rural Development Committees

Secretary's Memorandum No. 1667 provides for the establishment of a USDA Committee for Rural Development in each State. Membership includes representatives from six USDA agencies: Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, the State Cooperative Extension Service and the Economic Research Service.

Each USDA Committee was to "establish liaison with the executive officers of the State government and other appropriate organizations." The Committee was also directed to "work closely with State and local people in support of comprehensive planning and development."

State-USDA Committees for Rural Development have been organized in all 50 States and Puerto Rico and have just completed their first full year of work.

The coordinated Rural Development efforts of these six agencies -- which collectively reach out into every rural community of America -- have become an important link in the chain of information and technical assistance flowing to rural America from the USDA.

Secretary's Memorandum No. 1667 also called for recognizing that development is the primary responsibility of local people. However, the role of coordinator is appropriate for Committees and suggests a number of other roles--including catalyzer, educator, discoverer, facilitator and analyst. In keeping with the spirit of leaving "most details of the development process to local determination," the Committees have not assumed the roles of advocate, activist or crusader for a cause.

Each State Committee elects its own officers, develops its own operating procedures and enlarges its membership as it sees fit.

Membership. On June 30, 45 Committees included members of USDA agencies other than the "core" agencies. The additional agency most frequently represented was the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

Forty-two Committees include representatives from State government, typically representatives from the Governor's office and/or the State planning agency. Twenty-nine State Foresters are members. Twenty-nine had members from State Land-Grant Universities, most commonly someone from the Agricultural Experiment Station. In addition, 14 States had expanded their basic membership to include representatives from Federal agencies other than USDA at the State level and 12 included representatives from outside of government. (see Table 1)

In 18 States, Rural Development is considered so important that Statewide Rural Development groups have been formed by the Governor, the General Assembly or by other groups with Statewide interest in RD. These usually have broad-based memberships. The USDA State Committees relate to these State groups through interlocking memberships and other ways.

For instance, the Chairman of the USDA State RD Committee is an ex-officio member of the Illinois Cabinet on Rural Development, created by Executive Order of the Governor on April 6, 1971. In Ohio, the USDA Committee is a part of the overall State Resources Development Committee. In South Dakota, the Governor has organized a State RD Committee and the USDA Committee is working closely with this group to see how the USDA agencies can best cooperate with the Governor's office on multi-county planning. Members of the Virginia USDA Council are a part of, and work closely with, the Virginia Resources Council.

This sampling illustrates how, in many ways, USDA Committees are working for total Rural Development in their respective States.

Organization. Most State Committees have established task forces or sub-committees of various kinds to help carry out their objectives. Again, a sampling of State activities may help explain the kinds of things Committees are attempting to accomplish.

The Alabama USDA Rural Development Council operates with ad-hoc committees appointed by the Chairman on situations and issue areas which need the specific attention and/or action of the Council. Louisiana has six working committees; Mississippi has six areas of emphasis, with a Committee member responsible for providing overall leadership in each area. Nevada has decided to concentrate on efforts on rural housing and rural recreation, having named a sub-committee for each. North Carolina has a State Task Force on Rural Housing and 99 County RD panels. The State Task Force consists of representatives of six private groups, North Carolina State University, University of North Carolina, county and municipal governments, seven State agencies and six Federal agencies. Rhode Island has three sub-committees working on a Resource Development and Conservation project for the State. The Texas Committee has appointed a sub-committee to study and make recommendations concerning some type of risk credit for industrial growth in rural areas of the State.

Table 1.--Composition of State and Substate Rural Development Committees, Fiscal Year 1971

State	Number of State Committee Members						State rural affairs council, cabinet, or group	Number of area committees	Number of county committees
	USDA, including Extension	Other Federal agencies	State agencies	Other university members	Citizen groups, organizations, firms, etc.	Total membership			
Alabama	7	1	5	2	1	16	0	0	67*
Alaska	6	4	11	3	3	27	x	0	0
Arizona	21	18	42	13	15	109	0	0	13
Arkansas	13	0	1	1	0	15	0	8	75*
California	9	0	4	0	0	13	0	0	0
Colorado	8	3	8	3	5	28	x	12	0
Connecticut	5	2	5	5	0	17	0	0	0
Delaware	7	0	1	1	0	9	0	0	0
Florida	16	6	15	9	10	62	0	0	66
Georgia	5	0	6	4	4	19	0	0	154
Hawaii	4	2	0	0	0	6	0	0	4
Idaho	8	0	1	1	0	10	x	0	44*
Illinois	12	0	2	0	0	14	x	7	74
Indiana	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0
Iowa	9	0	1	1	0	11	x	3	99*
Kansas	11	0	2	0	1	14	0	0	105*
Kentucky	7	0	2	0	2	11	x	12	112
Louisiana	9	0	3	1	0	13	x	0	64*
Maine	7	0	4	2	0	13	0	1	14
Maryland	9	0	10	2	8	29	x	2	0
Massachusetts	11	2	7	3	1	24	0	0	0
Michigan	7	2	0	0	0	9	x	1	57
Minnesota	8	0	0	0	0	8	0	9	0
Mississippi	7	0	3	1	0	11	0	0	82*
Missouri	8	0	6	2	0	16	x	20	0
Montana	13	0	1	2	0	16	0	0	56*
Nebraska	6	0	1	0	0	7	0	26	0

Continued-

Table 1.--Composition of State and Substate Rural Development Committees, Fiscal Year 1971
-Continued

State	Number of State Committee Members						State rural affairs council, cabinet, or group	Number of area committees	Number of county committees
	USDA, including Extension	Other Federal agencies	State agencies	Other university members	Citizen groups, organizations, firms, etc.	Total membership			
Nevada	7	0	0	1	0	8	x	0	0
New Hampshire	7	0	2	1	0	10	0	0	0
New Jersey	10	0	5	0	0	15	0	2	8
New Mexico	7	0	1	1	0	9	0	6	0
New York	7	0	9	0	0	16	0	12	0
North Carolina	7	0	5	2	0	14	0	0	100*
North Dakota	7	0	1	0	0	8	0	2	49
Ohio	9	0	0	0	1	10	x	2	84
Oklahoma	8	0	1	1	0	10	x	0	77*
Oregon	7	2	8	0	0	17	0	14	4
Pennsylvania	7	0	2	1	0	10	0	3	65
Puerto Rico	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	5	72
Rhode Island	7	2	6	1	0	16	0	0	0
South Carolina	6	0	2	0	0	8	0	10	0
South Dakota	7	0	0	0	0	7	x	2	67*
Tennessee	7	0	2	0	0	9	x	8	95*
Texas	6	0	4	1	0	11	0	0	252*
Utah	6	2	2	1	0	11	0	8	0
Vermont	8	1	7	1	0	17	x	5	0
Virginia	6	0	0	0	0	6	x	0	0
Washington	11	5	14	1	1	32	x	4	39*
West Virginia	7	0	7	0	0	14	0	0	0
Wisconsin	6	0	11	0	0	17	0	0	69
Wyoming	9	0	4	0	0	13	0	0	23*
Total	416	52	234	68	52	822	18	184	2,090

*All counties in the State.

0013

Forty-one States have organized area or district RD Committees or county Committees, or both area and county Committees, in addition to the State Committee. Many have local citizens on these local committees. All told, there are 184 area or district Committees in 25 States and 2,090 county committees in 30 States. This gives an indication of the flexibility of the organization from State to State and illustrates how each State is given the latitude to carry out the RD effort in the most feasible, efficient manner for the particular circumstances (Table 1).

Activities. The scope and breadth of activities being carried out by State Committees is, again, varied and innovative. The Committees are addressing themselves to a number of the issue areas which form the components for revitalizing rural areas. The activities of these committees are reported under the program thrusts. The following breakdown shows the number of Committees giving special emphasis to some of the more important issue areas.

Issue Area	Number of Different USDA Committees Emphasizing
Housing	24
Sewer, water and solid waste disposal	19
Environmental protection	17
Business and industrial development	16
Leadership and overall rural development	14
Comprehensive planning	12
Manpower development, job training and education	12
Health and welfare	9
Recreation and tourism	7

Information and Technical Assistance Provided by the Land-Grant Universities

The Land-Grant universities played a vital role in helping citizens, voluntary groups and public policy-making bodies enhance the process of Rural Development during fiscal 1971. This was a three-pronged role of training professional personnel to serve as leaders, conducting research to discover knowledge, new products and new ways of solving problems, and extending knowledge from the university campus to the citizens of the State.

The objectivity and neutrality of the Land-Grant university causes community leaders to look to the university for educational information and assistance relating to highly controversial issues as well as other Rural Development needs. The universities are responding to these demands and are building and disseminating a knowledge base to assist in the development of local communities.

Teaching. Training professionals to assist in rural and community development is a part of the ongoing academic program of most Land-Grant universities. In

addition to the traditional fields of city and regional planning, local government, public administration, economics and sociology, several Land-Grant universities are now offering, or are in the process of developing, programs and courses in community development. For example, the University of Missouri has a Department of Regional and Community Affairs and offers a Master's degree in Community Development. Purdue University in Indiana has just initiated a B.S. degree in Community Development. To meet the needs of present practitioners, intensive summer courses have been offered by such universities as Oklahoma State, Oregon State, Ohio State, Missouri, Colorado State, and Minnesota. Also, each year more courses are being offered to help the student eventually become a better citizen and leader in his community.

Research. In research, every Land-Grant university has studies underway which will provide vital information to help local communities make more knowledgeable decisions. These range from studies to design more effective sewage disposal systems to analyses of the impact of alternative State and local tax systems.

To give added emphasis to Rural Development research, the Experiment Station Directors in two regions agreed to support regional research centers. One is at Iowa State University serving the North Central Region, and the other is at Oregon State University serving the Western Region. The Northeast Directors are considering a similar center. In addition to conducting research, these centers of excellence will help stimulate and coordinate Rural Development research in the regions.

Extension. The third role of the Land-Grant university is to disseminate to the citizens of the State knowledge from research findings and analysis, which will help build better communities.

The State Cooperative Extension Services have developed extensive educational delivery systems and programs for the development of rural America. Through its continuing program, hundreds of other university faculty served as resource persons at rural development conferences, workshops and consultations during fiscal 1971.

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

During fiscal year 1971, the Department expanded its efforts in rural development and devoted an estimated 3,200 man-years to providing information and technical assistance to local communities and districts and State Planning and Development groups (Table 2). The staff rendered an estimated 107,000 community or group assists during the year. (An "assist" is one or more staff members of an agency helping a community or group identify and resolve its problems.) This assistance was rendered through conducting an estimated 89,000 workshops, conferences and meetings, and 22,265 surveys and feasibility studies (Table 3). These were attended by key community leaders, public officials and other interested citizens seeking help in finding solutions to their pressing community problems. Thousands of individual consultations also occurred. In addition, more than 10,000 different bulletins, newsletters and fact sheets were prepared and more than 4.3 million copies of such materials were distributed. Some 188,000 radio and 25,000 TV broadcasts, announcements, and spots were prepared (Table 4).

Table 2.--Man-Years of Rural Development Information and Technical Assistance Delivered by USDA, FY 1971

Program Thrusts	Man-Years Expended
Leadership and Overall Rural Development	694
Comprehensive Planning	380
Water, Sewer, and Solid Waste Disposal	231
Recreation and Tourism	217
Environmental Protection	1,010
Health and Welfare	196
Housing	145
Business and Industrial Development	117
Manpower Development - Job Training and Education	90
Development of Rural Cooperatives	47
Electric and Telephone Development	25
Other Rural Development Efforts	48
Total	3,200

Table 3.--Rural Development Technical Assistance Delivered by USDA, FY 1971

Program thrusts	Types of Assistance			
	Project assists	Community or group assists	Meetings, workshops and conferences conducted or attended	Surveys or feasibility studies assisted
Leadership and overall rural development	67,473	40,682	43,460	1,010
Comprehensive planning	21,083	21,753	26,492	8,441
Water, sewer and solid waste disposal	9,707	9,144	17,930	3,013
Recreation and tourism	10,826	5,880	12,063	1,917
Environmental protection	22,105	12,923	17,634	3,334
Health and welfare	2,877	3,599	11,424	800
Housing	21,875	4,567	14,752	1,357
Business and industrial development	4,647	2,860	7,979	1,002
Manpower development - job training and education	2,418	2,592	5,107	529
Development of rural cooperatives	727	1,207	2,195	303
Electric and telephone development	426	864	2,074	365
Other	645	903	3,158	194
Total	164,809	106,974	163,925	22,265

Table 4.--Rural Development Information Delivered by USDA, FY 1971

Program thrusts	Materials prepared and distributed				
	News articles prepared	Bulletins, newsletters, fact sheets, prepared	Publications distributed	Broadcasts, announcements, and spots prepared	
				Radio	TV
Leadership and overall rural development	15,881	1,891	240,819	9,677	3,217
Comprehensive planning	29,520	288	387,446	17,746	2,375
Water, sewer and solid waste disposal	11,333	184	230,421	26,951	2,170
Recreation and tourism	6,354	763	163,808	22,520	1,886
Environmental protection	55,689	669	1,644,246	71,798	12,681
Health and welfare	2,571	908	242,492	5,233	444
Housing	6,217	2,067	391,920	3,211	444
Business and industrial development	4,836	489	295,624	5,545	1,206
Manpower development - job training and education	1,204	1,333	42,276	680	90
Development of rural cooperatives	274	74	70,153	278	56
Electric and telephone development	237	27	6,733	162	22
Other	680	1,397	54,348	24,501	103
Total	134,796	10,090	4,374,286	188,302	24,694

PROGRAM THRUSTS

Leadership and Overall Rural Development

Comprehensive Planning

Water, Sewer, and Solid Waste Disposal

Recreation and Tourism

Environmental Protection

Health and Welfare

Housing

Business and Industrial Development

Manpower Development - Job Training and Education

Development of Rural Cooperatives

Electric and Telephone Development

LEADERSHIP AND OVERALL RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The concerted rural development efforts of USDA during 1970-71 have reconfirmed past experiences and convictions -- community development occurs when and if leaders are informed, concerned, motivated, and knowledgeable of the community development processes. This applies to the professional public employee as well as the community citizen. The Department therefore invested some 694 man years in leadership development, maintenance of rural development organizations, and leadership assistance in program thrust areas.

Statistical Summary

Training or retraining of USDA field personnel in the process of community development was sponsored by 32 State USDA Rural Development Committees. The field staff was therefore better prepared to assist citizen groups in identifying and defining their needs, locating or supplying needed resources and technical assistance, and developing strategies for attaining goals.

The 51 State, 184 area, and 2090 county USDA Rural Development Committees serve as a mechanism for generating, coordinating, and disseminating technical and informational assistance to communities. Sustaining the operational functions of these 2,325 committees itself make a substantial contribution to professional leadership for rural development.

An important category of rural development supporters is the staff of other relevant Federal and State agencies. Personnel from these agencies were included in the 43,460 leadership meetings, workshops, and conferences conducted during the year.

Still another important cadre of rural development leaders is the citizen advisory bodies to FHA, Extension, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, SCS and other Department agencies. Reports from states indicate that these agency advisory committee members are active participants in citizen rural development committees, chambers of commerce, development corporations, and active supporters of community development projects. Technical and information assistance provided by USDA agencies to these groups had a multiplier effect through their linkages with, and participation in, other development groups and efforts.

Citizen leaders, groups and voluntary organizations receive a major portion of USDA leadership development. Reports from the State Rural Development Committees indicate that 40,682 leadership development assists were made to such groups in FY 1971. In addition, leadership capabilities were acquired and applied in areas of community concerns such as housing, manpower develop-

ment, business and industrial development, community facilities and services, and others. In this fashion, over 165,000 project assists were rendered by USDA agencies.

The most prominent methods or mechanisms for teaching and experiencing leadership development are meetings, studies, surveys, publications and mass media techniques. Leadership development and overall rural development accounted for 43,460 meetings, and 1,010 studies and surveys conducted by USDA agencies. In addition 15,881 news articles and 1,891 bulletins or information leaflets were prepared on rural and leadership development. Approximately 241,000 publications and other materials on the subject were distributed and 9,677 radio and 3,217 TV broadcasts were prepared by USDA and Extension personnel on the subject of leadership.

Highlights and Examples

In addition to public officials and private citizens, USDA and Extension provided training in leadership development to such organizations as chambers of commerce, local development corporations, planning commissions, civic clubs, councils of governments, housing authorities and a wide variety of other voluntary organizations. Maryland Extension Service conducted a training institute for 130 participants representing 20 such organizations in Maryland, Delaware and Virginia. The result was the learning of critical processes of community decision making, communications, coordination, and cooperation methods. IMPACT, a community simulation game, was used as a teaching tool.

Colorado narrowed the idea-to-action gap in communities with limited professional capabilities and inexperienced leadership by utilizing the services of a local activist as a citizen consultant. The pilot effort was financed by grants from industry, farm organizations and local governments. The consultant, a self-trained small-town businessman utilizing the services and resources of USDA, helped the community from problem awareness to action programs.

The "Build Our American Communities" program of the Future Farmers of America and FHA and the 4-H community leadership program of Extension are examples of extending community leadership opportunities to rural youth.

The payoff of effort in rural development leadership is in terms of increased social and economic benefits to the people in the community. The Franklin County Arkansas development Council, assisted by Extension and USDA agencies, studies the county situation in 1967 and set some goals. By July 1, 1971, the following goals had been reached or were in the process of being implemented:

-- The City of Ozark turned on water from a new supply lake, treatment facility and transmission lines. This project costs $1.7 million and is adequate for a projected growth of 20 years.

-- The City of Alix-Denning built a water distribution system which secures water from the Ozark system.

-- The City of Charleston is now involved in major improvements to its water system. The Cities of Branch and Webb City will build distribution systems this year.

-- In the area of recreation Ozark, Charleston, and Altus have started improvements in recreational facilities. Ozark built one $225,000 recreation complex and is planning another.

The Development Council, of Pickett County, Tenessee has now launched a county-wide housing program to build 340 housing units. These include low rent, leased, and low interest housing.

The Rural Development Committee of Pickett County asked for and received six training sessions in problem identificiation, program planning and problem solving.

Since the training the committee has developed and printed a county brochure showing scenic, historic and recreational areas of the county. Their industrial development committee has succeeded in securing a new leather working industry that will employ approximately 600 people. The committee has also been successful in getting the needed utilities and water and sewerage facilities to the industrial plant. The committee used the resources of agencies such as the Economic Development Administration, Farmers Home Administration, and the State Industrial Development Commission in accomplishing its goals.

By an Executive Order in May, 1970, North Carolina was divided into 17 multi-county planning regions. In order to be assured of open communications and close coordination, the Albemarle Area Development Association, a lay organization encompassing 10 Northeastern counties, put forth special efforts that resulted in close linkage with the new program and organizations.

When the Governor's office announced the State would be divided into planning regions, the Area Association sent a delegation to the Governor and the State Planning Officer. The committee carried with them resolutions from county governments and a historical resumé of examples of successful cooperation between the counties. This action resulted in the boundaries of Region R being established to coincide with those the the Area Association.

In order to take advantage of the opportunities offered by the Economic Development Administration, the Area Association sponsored and submitted a proposal to have the 10 county area designated as an Economic Development District. The proposal was accepted and the region was designated in April, 1971. In developing the structure required by EDA guidelines of the EDA, the Area Association Board of Directors became the lay advisory group for open communications and close cooperation.

The newly formed EDD, the Albemarle Planning and Development Commission, now has clearing house responsibilities for State and Federal programs. A resolution advocating this action was sent from the Area Association to the Department of Administration.

Also, the Area Association, in cooperation with State Soil and Water Conservation Districts, is the sponsoring agency for a proposal to have two RC&D Districts designated within its boundaries.

The Albemarle Area Development Association is one of 10 such Area Associations in the State. Its efforts have been supported and complemented by Extension and several USDA organizations and agencies. These agencies have assisted leaders of the Area Association in understanding and applying the community development process. The association is continually keeping abreast of new programs and opportunities as they emerge.

In Montana a task force representing seven USDA agencies developed a State situation statement. It served as the basis for the State Committee's plan of work and has had national distribution. Maryland prepared a brochure, "A Catalyst for Progress," explaining the goals and objectives of its Rural Affairs Council. Several thousand copies have been distributed in the State and nationally. Other States issuing publications on various aspects of Rural Development include: Mississippi, North Carolina, Michigan, South Dakota, West Virginia and Washington.

The North Dakota Rural Development Committee met with representatives of the Department of Defense, State agencies and representatives of communities affected to coordinate efforts at all levels to assist in identifying and meeting problems of the Safeguard ABM Impact Area.

Non-urban areas in five States have been selected by the USDA to test the effects of a concentration of program efforts in Rural Development. The State RD Committees in South Carolina, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, Oregon and Ohio are providing leadership for these inter-agency efforts. Ohio reports enthusiastic support for the pilot project from all USDA agencies. The program is unique in that: (1) the 20 identified leaders of the community (covering all or parts of seven counties) are united to solve problems from a total community point of view, (2) all USDA agencies at the local, State and National levels are committed and (3) significant efforts will be made to measure the change resulting from the project.

Ohio State University provides additional examples of how faculty from outside the College of Agriculture and Home Economics were involved in Cooperative Extension programs dealing with community resource development. Examples include: (1) working with faculty from the College of Law on a bulletin entitled, "Liability and Insurance Protection Principles for Recreational Enterprises," (2) assistance from members of the Political Science Department on reorganizing local governments, (3) assistance from

the Geography Department on land use, and (4) assistance from a professor in the College of Administrative Sciences who served as one of the major resource persons at 10 seminars on State and local finance and taxation. More than 600 community leaders from 27 counties attended these seminars. They included State legislators, elected city, county and township officials, school officials, and other community influentials. The objective and unbiased analysis and presentation by Extension and university resource people allowed people with many different viewpoints to come together and discuss the controversial issue of taxation.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

The Department has been involved in a wide array of services in the organization and operation of planning districts in almost every State. Information and technical assistance has been provided to Regional Economic Development Commissions, State planning agencies, Economic Development Districts, RC&D Projects, Housing and Urban Development 701-funded non-metropolitan planning districts and counties and municipalities.

A detailed report on USDA assistance to HUD 701-funded nonmetropolitan planning districts has been provided Congress separately as required under Title IX Sec. 901(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1970.

Statistical Summary

As indicated in Tables 2 and 3 more than 21,000 planning districts, agencies, communities and groups were provided information and technical assistance on comprehensive planning during FY 1971. This involved some 26,500 meetings, workshops and conferences and more than 8,400 surveys and studies. The Department prepared 288 bulletins, newsletters and fact sheets on planning and planning assistance available and distributed almost 400,000 copies. About 50,000 news articles and radio and TV broadcasts were also prepared. About 380 man-years were devoted to information and technical assistance in comprehensive planning.

Highlights and Examples

Throughout the last program year, State Extension Services have had a major role in all phases of comprehensive planning. In many instances, Extension personnel have worked with State agencies of the Governor's office in delineating sub-State districts and working with district planners. In other instances, agents have worked with Councils of Government or within local county or other local units of Government planning districts on such programs as land use, zoning, water, sewage, solid waste disposal, fire, health and police services and similar programs with multi-jurisdictional planning that will enhance the social and economic life of rural residents.

Extension has held many meetings and assisted in delivering mass media programs to educate the general public on the need for planning, what planning can do and what it can't do. This has been of major assistance to local officials and planners in developing plans and getting public acceptance. Most county and area Extension agents serve in some capacity on local county and multi-county district planning boards and commissions.

SCS plays an active role in comprehensive planning. State Conservationists have been responsive to the soil, water, and related resources planning and development needs of the local planning entities through SCS Area and District offices. SCS has leadership in the RC&D program. Wherever an RC&D is associated with a district planning agency, RC&D activities are primarily

of a functional natural resource planning and development nature. Where other planning bodies do not exist, RC&D activities are more comprehensive in nature. SCS personnel serve on technical advisory committees to 168 district planning agencies.

The Forest Service and cooperating State Foresters provide information and technical assistance related to forest resources to planning agencies. Examples of assistance include providing resource data, industrial development feasibility studies, environmental impact advice, land use planning advice, and recreational studies. Formal arrangements have been made by the Forest Service with State Foresters to provide full-time or part-time assistance to six State planning agencies, 12 multi-county planning and development agencies, and 57 RC&D projects. The Forestry Planning Specialist, Virginia Division of Forestry, has compiled Forest Resources studies for the West Piedmont, Accomack-Northampton, Southside, and Lenowisco Planning Districts. A fifth study--covering the Cumberland Plateau Planning District --is underway. These studies are used as a basis for comprehensive land use plans.

The Forest Service assisted the town of Twining, New Mexico, in planning the development of the town. Twining is entirely surrounded by National Forest lands. The coordinated plan will result in the orderly development of the town in relation to the surrounding National Forest.

The Northwest Planning and Development Region, Arkansas, and the Ozark-St. Francis Forest Supervisor, have organized a road planning committee. Public hearings have been held regarding routing, priorities for development established, and funding sources explored. This coordinated effort will provide maximum use of public and National Forest road systems and funds.

Over 50 percent of the land in the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency area is in forest. The California and Nevada State Foresters and Forest Service have made major resource and economic inputs into the Tahoe Basin environmental land management plan.

The Economic Research Service has established a Development District Information System (DDIS). This system is designed to provide information on the current status of State-designated multi-county planning and development districts. In addition, it contains information on other multi-county planning and development districts such as Councils of Governments, Economic Development Districts, RC&D Projects, and HUD 701 nonmetropolitan planning and development projects. Information is obtained from districts and State planning agencies through a network of ERS field personnel. Information is also obtained from other Federal agencies and private research and planning agencies.

The DDIS has supplied information about the status of State-delineated districts to: (a) Federal Departments--several agencies in the Departments of Agriculture and HUD, Office of Economic Opportunity and Economic Development Administration; (b) Congress--Rural Development Subcommittee of the

Senate Agriculture Committee; (c) Governmental Councils--The Councils of State Governments, National Governors' Conference, National Association of Counties, and Appalachian Regional Commission; (d) Private Information Services--National Service to Regional Councils; (e) Private, Religious and University Research Organizations; Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA); Dominican Education Center; National Area Development Institutes, Lexington, Kentucky; University of California, Berkeley; and University of Georgia; and (f) State Rural Development Committees through ERS field personnel.

Virginia and Missouri held meetings to explore ways to bring about a closer working relationship among USDA Committees, the State Chapter of the American Institute of Planners and the State planning agency. A two-day workshop in Virginia for 70 staff persons from planning and USDA agencies was followed by a series of regional workshops.

The Rural Electrification Administration relies heavily upon its electric and telephone borrowers to provide information and technical assistance to regional planning agencies. Directors or employees of 466 borrowers responding to a recent inquiry are active in a total of 712 community development organizations. A program of great potential and early accomplishment is the Stand Tall Commissions program sponsored by 21 REA borrowers through their Statewide association in South Carolina.

Impact on the nine communities where Stand Tall Commissions have been formed has been immediate and powerful. People who had been caught in the backwash of rural decay now have new hope. Abandoned rural schools are being reopened as technical, home economics and day care centers. Enabling legislation has been introduced before the South Carolina legislature to make more complete use of these schools, many new and in excellent repair.

REA has pledged its assistance to the Stand Tall Programs. The Agency expedites Stand Tall projects on the national level. REA is publishing a 16-page brochure on the Stand Tall story, "Action Now -- Total Community Development Through Co-op Leadership," in an effort to help other borrowers learn how they might make similar programs work in their own service areas.

In New Hampshire, university faculty assisted the Keene planning office to draft specification for an economic base study. They also served in an advisory capacity to many local planning boards and worked with regional boards to develop plans.

In Minnesota, university faculty were highly involved in data collection and analysis used for the delineation of the State Development Regions. The university's Analysis and Planning System also furnishes economic and social data to local leaders and public officials through teletypewriter (TWX) terminals.

WATER, SEWER, AND SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

Safe, dependable water supplies and sanitary, pollution-free sewer and waste disposal systems are essential if rural communities are to prosper and have a healthy and clean environment. Yet thousands of small towns and rural communities lack public water and waste disposal systems. Technical and informational assistance is essential to alleviate these unhealthy and growth-inhibiting conditions.

Statistical Summary

FHA provided financing for a record-breaking 1,400 community water and waste disposal systems during fiscal year 1971. This record could not have been made had not the full information and technical assistance been available, since FHA is only one of the suppliers of credit for rural water and waste disposal systems.

Nationwide, USDA agencies helped more than 12,157 communities in surveying their needs for sewer, water, and solid waste disposal facilities and in determining the feasibility of providing such facilities. Assistance was given in developing more than 9,707 specific projects.

Over 230,000 publications of an informational and educational nature, along with about 17,954 items for the news media, were prepared and distributed. Altogether, USDA agency staff members in the various States expended more than 230 man-years in providing communities information and technical assistance on their sewer, water, and solid waste disposal problems.

Highlights and Examples

Specific areas of assistance included:

--dissemination of information about the availability of State and Federal financing for sewer, water, and solid waste disposal facilities.

--training of administrative and operating personnel associated with water and waste disposal facilities.

--preparation of comprehensive sewer and water plans.

--organization of rural water and sewer districts.

--development of multicounty arrangements for waste disposal.

--location and development of satisfactory sites for sanitary landfills.

--exploration of alternative ways of disposing of animal waste.

The State Rural Development Committees worked both as a team and, as necessary, as individual agencies to provide information and technical assistance related to water, sewer and solid waste disposal facilities.

West Virginia, through the State Rural Development Committee, known as "Mountaineers for Rural Progress," initiated and sponsored a conference on waste disposal in cooperation with the Governor's office. The purpose of the conference was to stimulate more interest and action on the part of agencies, individuals, and county governments in helping to overcome the waste disposal problem. Based on oral and written comments, observations, and through work with other groups, the door has apparently been opened for greater cooperation and pooling of resources to attack this problem. This meeting appears to have established a point of reference for future activities.

Many small communities in Nevada have limited or no domestic water or sewer systems available. The State USDA Rural Development Committee became directly involved in determining the situation in the various rural communities and discussed the possibility of sewer and/or water loans and grants that might be available to the community.

The State Planning Board, the County Commissioners and the Regional Planning Boards were all contacted and information presented concerning the need and the possible loans or grants available to meet this need. The FHA and the Extension Service provided leadership for this effort, which also involved Forest Service, SCS and ASCS personnel. The educational programs associated with this effort with the County Commissioners, planning groups, etc., were carried out jointly with Extension Service and FHA. As a result of this effort, 11 communities have submitted applications for loans or grants.

In Illinois the FHA community services staff held a workshop with consulting engineers to find better ways of designing water and sewer disposal systems in low population density areas. Although the meeting was related especially to present and prospective FHA projects, the information developed is having a beneficial effect on systems financed through commercial credit. Articles for professional magazines and journals have been prepared by staff engineers.

With the current emphasis on environmental protection and pollution abatement, a great deal of interest has been generated in rural areas for the development of community solid waste disposal systems. Passage of more stringent state laws governing the disposal of waste has often been the initiating force. Faced with serving a scattered population and the relatively high expenditures involved, local governments have had to give careful consideration to the comparable merits of different systems to serve their peculiar needs and have been hard pressed to devise satisfactory methods of financing. Often the development of facilities on a cooperating basis with neighboring jurisdictions is the only alternative.

Forest Service and Extension Service have assisted rural communities in deciding on best alternatives for disposal of solid waste. Typical of Forest Service involvement in planning solid waste disposal is an activity in

Missouri. An an example, one State-employed forester met with city officials, a garden club and concerned citizens in a mobile park development to help them develop reclamation plans for a completed sanitary landfill and to develop living screen plantings where a new landfill will be opened. The old fill will be used as a bird sanctuary and for youth group camping. The new fill will be screened from the existing mobile home park and the city golf course by tree plantings.

In this same State, working with a county representative, the highway department and city officials, a State forester helped develop a planting screen to hide a junkyard located at the junction of a State and Federal highway, within the city limits. The forester developed the plans, the city will provide the funds and labor and the highway department will maintain the area. Other states where substantial technical assistance has been provided by the Forest Service include California, Arkansas, Florida, Colorado, Georgia, Texas and Louisiana. In Louisiana, for example, it granted permits for ground water supply systems for two communities to plots of 10.6 acres and 6.7 acres, respectively.

SCS technical assistance included guidance in obtaining sewage and animal waste disposal facilities, sanitary landfill, industrial and domestic water facilities and health and sanitary codes and ordinances.

In St. Clair County, Alabama, the County Commissioners recently adopted a plan to provide house-to-house solid waste collection for every household in the county, including municipalities wishing to join the system. The plan also calls for operation of a sanitary landfill. The Commission has already secured favorable action from many of the county's 12 municipalities. Operating details are being worked out.

The project was initiated and promoted by the County Rural Development Committee. A major contribution of the committee was to generate local concern among citizens and elected officials for a more healthful and orderly way of handling and disposing of solid waste materials. A subcommittee was appointed to secure the support of county and municipal governing bodies and to guide the project through the planning stage. Studies and alternate system proposals were prepared by Extension and local and state health department personnel at the request of the county committee and the county commission. Significant contributions were also made to the development of this project by personnel of the Alabama Development Office and the Birmingham Regional Planning Commission. According to information available from the Alabama State Health Department, this will be the first rural countywide, house-to-house collection system in the Nation.

The Utah State Rural Development Committee worked with the Economic Development Administration, Four Corners Regional Commission, Farmers Home Administration and local people to secure more than $1 million to finance a water system for three rural communities.

RECREATION AND TOURISM

Another major thrust of the rural development effort of the Department is directed toward recreation and tourism. Extension Specialists assisted communities in the coordination of county and community recreational needs and opportunities. USDA personnel assisted in the organization and development of park boards, acquainted community officials with various State and Federal programs providing assistance in recreation and tourism, conducted surveys to determine recreation facilities available and additional facilities needed, and provided information on numbers of tourists visiting the area as well as ways to attract additional tourists for longer periods of time.

Workshops provide park board members a keener insight into their duties and responsibilities, community leaders are made aware of their recreational needs and opportunities, and workers in motels, restaurants, and recreational complexes are provided training in better serving their clientele.

Extension and SCS have assisted soil and water conservation districts and other State and Federal agencies and organizations in inventorying public and private recreation facilities. In many states SCS cooperates with Extension and local soil and water conservation districts in appraising the potential for recreation development. Information needed to make decisions regarding land use and treatment is provided local units of government. These decisions often result in formal regulations or zoning laws needed to preserve or control resources for recreational use and environmental enhancement.

County Rural Development committees are often the vehicle in providing informational, technical and educational materials needed by lay leaders as well as local government officials in planning to provide needed recreational opportunities as well as to make wise use of natural resources.

Statistical Summary

During FY 1971 the Department assisted 10,826 local projects in recreation and tourism. A total of 5,880 local community groups were assisted with public recreation projects and 12,063 meetings or workshops were conducted by USDA staff on recreation. The Department assisted with 1,917 feasibility studies of public and private recreational projects. In addition, 6,354 news articles on recreation and 763 bulletins and newsletters were prepared on recreation and tourism in FY 1971. A total of 163,808 recreation and tourism publications were distributed while 22,520 radio broadcasts and 1,886 TV telecasts were presented on recreation and tourism. Man-years spent on recreation and tourism by USDA personnel totaled 217 during FY 1971.

Highlights and Examples

In Georgia the State Forester assisted the State Park Division in the planning and development of a recreation area for the handicapped at Fort Yargo State Park.

The Forest Service and State Forester have been providing technical planning and development information and advice to Georgia mountain area communities, development groups, institutions and individuals on ski resorts, ski trails, and campgrounds.

In Indiana progress continued in development of the National Forest recreation resources as a part of the Lincoln Hills Resource Conservation and Development program. Initial developments were completed at the Initial Point Historical Site. At this place in Indiana the first public land survey system was begun. This site was developed cooperatively with the Indiana Historical Landmarks, Inc., and construction including a park, access roads, and historical marker was contributed by Operation Mainstream, Green Thumb,and the Job Corps Conservation Center.

Tourist development and promotion in Northwest Louisiana will be coordinated on an area basis by the Northwest Louisiana Tourist Association, organized in early 1971 under the leadership of the Louisiana Rural Development Committee, working through its subcommittee on recreation, wildlife and tourism.

The Association, which encompasses 12 parishes (counties), is organized to afford efficient utilization of resources by fostering more coordination among those involved in tourist promotion and development. It will provide a unified approach in place of the current piecemeal efforts.

Several local Rural Development Committees became interested in tourist development and contacted the State Committee for advice and assistance. The idea of a unified area approach grew out of these contacts.

The Cooperative Extension Service helped with a planning meeting. Local Rural Development Committees invited interested citizens of the 12 parishes to explore the feasibility of setting up an association. Citizens' groups and organizations involved in the organizational stage included chambers of commerce, local planning groups, Rural Development and RC&D recreation and tourism committees, local economic development groups, Extension advisory committees and local historical and preservation clubs.

Citizens at the first meeting agreed that an association should be organized. They selected a representative from each parish to comprise a steering committee to propose the initial framework.

The steering committee met two weeks later and once each month thereafter. A set of bylaws was drawn up, officers were elected, and priority was given to a thorough inventory of the area's tourism and recreation resources and to publicizing the attractions already developed. Action has also been taken toward cooperative funding of the association by local and State governments.

By coordinating the efforts of several groups involved, the Association will bring about a more feasible and economical approach to tourist development.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Protection of the environment, together with cultural, recreational and other leisure-time opportunities, is essential to a better quality of life in rural America. The Department contributes in large measure to environmental protection through programs such as the Rural Environmental Assistance Program (REAP), Cooperative Fire Control, Flood Prevention, River Basin Planning, Cooperative Forest Management, and programs contributing to suitable housing, sewage, and solid waste disposal, land use planning and landscape improvement.

Statistical Summary

During FY 1971, Department personnel provided environmental protection assistance to almost 13,000 communities and groups on more than 22,000 separate projects. This assistance included 3,334 surveys and studies and more than 17,600 meetings, workshops and conferences, directly concerned with environmental protection and enhancement. Considerable attention and effort was devoted to programs of information and education to inform rural residents of pollution problems, landscape improvement opportunities and ways in which communities and citizens could help themselves with Federal and other sources of help.

Over 55,000 news articles were prepared for use in newspapers and periodicals. Over 660 bulletins, fact sheets, and other materials were prepared and some 1.6 million copies distributed. USDA prepared and/or participated in about 84,500 radio and television broadcasts and spot announcements.

USDA's Environmental Thrust

The Department initiated an Environmental Thrust effort to provide support to rural America in cleaning up its air, water and landscape, and eliminating various noxious pests and waste products.

The Department has a wide array of scientists and technical specialists in its State and National offices, universities and almost every county in the Nation. State and local Rural Development Committees include key people of State and other public agencies to lend even broader support to the Environmental Thrust. Furthermore, REAP shares with rural landowners the cost of carrying out approved soil, water, woodland, and wildlife conservation and pollution abatement practices on their land.

Highlights and Examples

The Soil Conservation Service provides technical assistance and information to community leaders, organizations, and State and local units of Government in the management and use of soil, water, and related resources that meet quality standards for sustained use without degradation to the environment while providing for the needs of the community.

Twelve project measure work plans have been prepared for roadside stabilization in the Ozark Foothills Resource Conservation and Development Project in Fulton, Izard, and Sharp Counties in Arkansas covering some 65 miles of rural roads. Sponsors of these project measures are the Ozark Foothills RC&D Steering Committee, conservation districts, and county governments. The county governments serve as the legal entity for installation, operation and maintenance.

Road ditches in most of the hill country are subject to active erosion resulting in heavy off-site silt and sediment damage to streams and reservoirs in the area. Vegetative cover essential to the control of erosion is difficult to establish and maintain.

Local residents along the county roads agreed to set back fencing and provide a minimum 60-foot right-of-way. The county RC&D Committee, county judges, and Soil Conservation Service personnel developed plans for treating each section of road. County governments shaped and graded roadbeds and side slopes. Soil Conservation Service was responsible for vegetative work, with local residents hired through the Green Thumb Program and other funds doing the work.

Farmers Home Administration has participated in numerous seminars to bring out the concern and opportunties for improving the environment through the most efficient waste control measures.

Plantings for wildlife habitat were made in 41 states under a cost showing program with the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS) and their Rural Environmental Assistance Program (REAP). Cooperating with the program in the States include the Soil Conservation Service, Extension Service, Forest Service and State Wildlife Associations. States with major emphasis in this program include Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Michigan and Florida.

The program provides plans that not only furnishes protection for wildlife but in many cases reduces wind and water eriosion and enhances the environment.

Fire prevention and erosion control efforts in cooperation with local people or agenciesare major environmental activities of the Forest Service. An increasingly important activity has been the sponsoring and conducting of outdoor environmental education workshops for students and teachers. The primary aim of the workshops is to expose rural educators to Forest Service ecological demonstration sites and to help teachers develop confidence in outdoor teaching techinques.

In California, Forest Service personnel were involved in planning and participating in three teacher workshops for conservation education. Three television shows on environmental protection were also prepared, two for the USDA program "Across The Fence," and one for the Dinah Shore program "Dinah's Place." Forest Service personnel were active in Earth Day programs across the Nation.

Experimental tree planting and advice were provided for the rehabilitation of the severely eroding island of Kahoolowe, a U.S. Navy property in Hawaii. In Missouri and Kansas, the State Foresters are working closely with rural towns across their respective States in environmental protection and enhancement programs through cooperative agreements for cost-sharing grants with the Forest Service.

One of the major areas receiving attention at the Forest Products Laboratory in Madison, Wisconsin is the recycling of fibrous materials in solid waste for making paper and paper board. The solution of this problem will benefit both urban and rural areas.

One objective of Extension Resource Development Agents in environmental protection is to increase awareness and understanding of critical environmental problems. In Oregon's Willamette Valley, 48,000 questionnaires were distributed to spark discussion and thought on the Valley's particular environmental problems.

Comprehensive land use education programs were developed in 25 States, including slide sets, publications, and tours. In Iowa, for example, 12 day-long Environmental Seminars were held, reaching 2,000 different community leaders.

In North Carolina, 180 meetings of Extension-sponsored environmental committees resulted in 43 countywide campaigns on environmental education and 41 solid waste disposal plans.

Several pesticide container disposal programs were initiated by Extension Agents. Central disposal sites were developed in some counties. State Extension Specialists provided printed material on pesticide container disposal.

The Extension Agent in the New Hampshire RC&D District initiated a program in junk car removal that resulted in two new private car shredder businesses and the removal of 16,000 junk cars in two months.

Water quality problems were the largest of several Extension RD programs. The area RD agents in the Missouri Lake of the Ozarks region developed a significant campaign to stop pollution and save the water quality of that tourist area.

Twelve State Rural Development Committees were directly involved in environmental protection projects in FY 1971. In West Virginia, 32 counties are participating in a joint stream cleanup program initiated by the State Department of Natural Resources. The State Committee has committed staff resources to the success of this program. County rural development committees assumed local responsibility for providing key leadership. During the campaign, 1,000 high school students were employed

under the Neighborhood Youth Corps program to do litter cleanup, brushing, stream channel clearance, and water sampling. Participation by agencies, civil groups, industry, and individuals has been outstanding.

In Florida, a countywide cleanup campaign in Hamilton County led to a new timber products company employing 70 people in the town of Jasper. An executive from a prospective industry was so impressed by the cleanliness of the town and the cooperative spirit of the citizens that he decided to look no further.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

During the past year a substantial part of the resources available to States--primarily through the Extension Service and the Food and Nutrition Service--was devoted to the Expanded Food and Nutrition Educational Program for increasing the knowledge and improving the nutritional habits of low-income families in both urban and rural areas and to the support of activities directed at the improvement of family health generally. From the rural development standpoint, there was much emphasis on the procurement and staffing of health facilities required to match the needs of the rural population.

Improvement of transportation facilities in recent years has reduced the need for complete medical services and facilities in some rural communities. However, many small towns and rural areas still do not have access to the specialized and comprehensive medical care enjoyed by those living in or near metropolitan areas. The lack of medical personnel in low-income areas is a pressing problem in many States. Medical doctors, nurses, and medical technicians are needed. A medical team in a mobile unit to make scheduled visits would help alleviate the tremendous need. With special effort it is often possible to upgrade rural area services through cooperative arrangements with nearby areas.

Statistical Summary

USDA agencies have helped communities develop more than 2,800 projects of various types, but primarily those involving the construction or modernization of health centers, clinics and other physical facilities, and the procurement of professional and subprofessional staff to man such facilities (Table 3).

Communities were helped in exploring various alternatives for providing health and welfare services. The aging, the handicapped, mentally retarded, and low-income families generally received special attention. Assistance to communities in developing organizational arrangements, often on a multi-county basis, to provide fire protection and emergency ambulance service, including the procurement of equipment and qualified personnel, was a common occurrence. Some other areas of concern emphasized included community programs dealing with drug use and abuse, safety, child care and development, alternative arrangements for financing health and medical facilities, the design of such facilities and laws and regulations governing their construction and operation, and the development of manpower training opportunities in the health field.

Fourteen States were assisted in preparing comprehensive health plans, adapting regional medical programs to the needs of specific rural communities and developing district or multi-county arrangements to provide certain health and medical services on a cooperative basis.

In assisting rural communities with their health and welfare problems in the various States, more than 11,000 community meetings, workshops or conferences were held with almost 200 man-years devoted to this activity. Approximately 240,000 publications of an informational and educational nature, along with some 5,700 items for the news media, were prepared and distributed (Table 4).

Highlights and Examples

USDA agencies cooperated with the Northwest Arkansas Planning and Development District and the community of Jasper in developing a general health and welfare improvement project plan. The USDA agencies actively participated in the organization and then helped conduct sanitation and cleanup drives.

USDA representatives and community leaders have worked cooperatively in North Carolina in securing health services and facilities for remote rural areas. They have assisted groups in organizing to secure proper medical and dental services and in developing organizations and groups to operate the services. The total welfare of the people in the counties and State has been considered in many aspects of Rural Development programs. Mental health, nutrition, physical checkups, dental care, and hygiene have all received significant emphasis in both youth and adult programs. The results are visible at the community, county, and regional levels.

Two hundred fifty-seven families in Morgan County, Kentucky, may save $25 per unit of blood used in transfusions as a result of a blood donor group organized through the support of the Extension staff and Homemakers Clubs.

Farm laborers in a migrant labor camp in Somerset County, Maryland, received training in adult basic education and in four skill areas. A child care center for migrant children was funded by the Maryland Council of Churches and operated for eight weeks in the camp. A total of 1,070 child care days was recorded.

HOUSING

Three years ago Congress reaffirmed the national housing goal adopted in 1948 of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." A great deal of progress has been made toward this goal. Yet, both percentage-wise and in absolute terms, the number of substandard homes in rural areas is still nearly twice that in metropolitan areas.

Over 50 percent of the poor housing is occupied by low-income families. The problem is aggravated by the fact that alternative sources of housing credit are usually much more limited in rural areas, both for consumers and builders.

There is a constant and continuing need for supplying community leaders and public officials, as well as consumers themselves, with information about types of assistance available and alternative ways of dealing with the problem. They also need to know about the contribution which adequate housing can make to the economic development of their areas.

Statistical Summary

During fiscal 1971, USDA personnel over the country helped more than 4,560 communities in surveying their housing needs and in reaching decisions as to how they should proceed. More than 21,800 specific projects were assisted. In the process nearly 392,000 information and educational publications, along with 9,872 items for the news media, were prepared and distributed. The USDA agencies expended more than 145 man-years on this particular activity.

During the past year, USDA agencies have participated in or conducted approximately 14,750 community meetings, workshops or conferences for the benefit of consumers, public officials, community leaders, builders, contractors, lenders and professional staffs to help them assess the extent of the housing problem and to acquaint them with alternative ways of improving the quality and quantity of housing in their respective areas. Special attention has been given to the needs of low-income families, including Indians, migrant workers and the elderly. Assistance has been provided in the organizing of housing authorities, training housing authority staffs and training tenants and prospective home owners to prepare them for assuming the responsibilities of home ownership. Additional assistance provided involved such things as:

- - organization and support of local groups to promote better housing for their communities.

- - zoning, building codes and site development.

- - housing plans for builders and prospective home owners.

- - advising on types of financial assistance available for housing construction.

- - housing choices available to accommodate varying needs.

- - development of multi-county arrangements for providing housing for low-income families.

- - organization and support of mutual self-help housing projects.

- - development of rental housing projects to accommodate rural people, particularly school teachers and other professional workers coming into the area, as well as the employees of new commercial and industrial enterprises locating in rural areas.

- - landscaping, renovation and home furnishings.

- - mobile homes and mobile home parks.

Highlights and Examples

State task forces or committees, usually comprised of representatives of Federal and State agencies, but sometimes including others having concern for housing, have been organized to promote and support efforts to provide adequate housing. States reporting significant results from this activity include Mississippi, North Carolina, West Virginia, Missouri and South Dakota.

The South Dakota State Rural Development Committee was active in the coordination of a Statewide rural housing survey and workshop. The survey instrument was drawn by the Extension Service and used in one pilot rural electric consumer area. The survey was repeated in most of North and South Dakota through the cooperation of Basin Electric, a North Dakota and South Dakota wholesale electric supplier. Following the survey, a low-cost housing workshop was held for rural electric and other agency personnel in Pierre. Extension specialists provided training in home design and heating. The FHA provided training in rural home financing under that agency's loan program. Representatives from the Federal Housing Administration conducted similar training on low-cost single and multiple housing purchases and rental programs. The State planning agency provided information on application procedures.

Adequate housing in rural Bedford County, Pennsylvania, was scarce. Permanent housing was more expensive than in other surrounding counties, even though average wages were lower in Bedford County. There were few local home builders. Most new housing was in mobile homes and this, in itself, was creating problems. The activity decided on was to coordinate ideas and assistance in working with community leaders so that more new home builders could be located who would build a low- to medium-priced home in the county.

Local lay leaders and governmental officials were involved. These included ministers, township supervisors, home builders and home builders associations, and the local rural electrification cooperative.

Each agency on the County Rural Development Committee participated. The County Extension Agent coordinated the activity and arranged for Forest Service house plans to be reviewed by the Committee for selection of an applicable low-cost plan. FHA assisted in establishing standards, provided information on financing and worked with builders in adjoining counties who were building FHA-financed homes and might consider building in Bedford County. These builders also helped develop usable simple house plans. REA, through the local cooperative, used its newsletter for inventory of interest, plan printing, and other ideas about the activity. SCS is preparing soils information to aid in selecting building sites.

Almost 15 percent of available housing in upstate New York is deteriorating or dilapidated. In some areas, the figure climbs to 25 percent. Thus, the State Community Development Committee (RD Committee) established housing as one of its four priority areas and created a housing sub-committee. In January 1971, the Committee cooperated with the New York State College of Human Ecology and Cooperative Extension to sponsor a three-day Colloquium on Rural Housing. First of its kind in New York, its purposes were increased understanding of the total rural housing problem and explanation of agency roles.

Ten agencies and organizations participated. The short-range goals of stimulating discussion and increasing understanding were achieved. Additionally, a start was made toward reaching a number of long-range goals, including a clearer understanding of what constitutes adequate housing, development of a more innovative attitude among builders, more flexible arrangements for low-income housing and increased cooperation at both the planning and programming levels among all organizations and agencies involved in rural housing.

Some members of the National, State and local Rural Development Committees have agency responsibilities that are closely related to housing concerns. The Extension Service, Farmers Home Administration and Forest Service report the greatest input in providing information and technical assistance. However, SCS made a substantial contribution by supplying soil survey information for building sites, and REA has encouraged its borrowers to assist in packaging applications for housing loans from the FHA.

The primary thrust by the Forest Service and the State Foresters has been promoting wood for housing and providing low-cost wooden house designs. Results of this effort are illustrated in the response to low-cost housing plans that incorporate features designed in homes because of research performed at the Forest Products Laboratory. A questionnaire sent to 1,600 people who received 4,000 sets of plans indicated that 170 homes were built--probably representing only a fraction of the houses actually built using these plans.

The Forest Service has assisted Oregon area residents to get building codes approved and provided a work training situation in building low-cost wood homes using Indian labor in Montana. Other States where the Forest Service helped in housing development were Wisconsin, California, Hawaii, Arkansas, Alaska, Alabama, and Louisiana.

The FHA held a series of workshops throughout Illinois in cooperation with the Illinois Lumber Dealers Association. In addition to lumber dealers, contractors, realtors, and other leaders attended. The success of these meetings led to their request for a similar series for 1972.

In South Carolina, FHA has worked with personnel involved with housing survey plans in the 10 Economic Districts. Workshops included individuals, contractors, and realtors. Publications on packaging of applications by private business were used in these workshops.

FHA provided financing for a record-breaking 118,000 new homes to low-and moderate-income rural families during fiscal year 1971. This record could not have been made without full information and technical assistance. Since FHA is only one of the suppliers of credit for rural homes, the total effect of the information and technical assistance targeted to overcome the lack of rural housing is substantial.

Recognizing that adequate housing is one of the most pressing needs in its State, the Mississippi RD Committee adopted a Statewide housing program and promotion as a pilot effort in fiscal year 1971. It appointed a State Housing Task Force of more than 40 leaders from the housing industry, related agencies and government to "promote improved housing which will contribute to economic growth of communities and better quality living for families." The State Task Force also provided leadership in promoting county housing task forces. More than 50 counties have planned and implemented the program. In one, Forrest County, more than 350 new rural homes have been built. Madison County has developed a comprehensive housing plan, Oktibbeha leaders have presented information to more than 200 persons enrolled in 10 basic education classes, Jefferson Davis County's housing task force has helped with housing surveys. Other county task forces have secured land for building sites; conducted cleanup, fixup campaigns; organized water associations; held home tours; held meetings with home builders and put out housing newsletters.

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Services performed by Department personnel cover the range of activities, both direct and ancillary, required to create employment in rural America. Direct assistance to new or expanding industries and businesses includes solving managerial, technical, personnel and fiscal problems. An important aspect of direct assistance is finding individuals with specialized technical knowledge from within Federal and State government, private industry and the academic community who can help communities with business and industrial development. USDA employees help entrepreneurs locate sources of financing at the Federal and State levels of government and lenders in the private sector. In many instances USDA people help by gathering backup data and assisting in filling out loan application forms. Economic studies are sometimes prepared relating to specific industries or specific geographic areas.

Ancillary, but necessary, services include assisting individuals, groups, cities, towns, counties and larger units of government inventory resources, analyze, plan and develop resources for business and industrial development. These services are used to prepare for the building of business and industrial sites and airports and transportation,communication and utility facilities.

No less important is helping local citizens develop capabilities to carry out job-creating activities, including assisting in the formation of local development corporations, industrial development groups, development committees and other citizen groups. The educational process of making citizens and local leaders aware of the requirements of business and industry are in many instances a requisite activity prior to any actual job-creating projects. An awareness of the necessity of having an attractive community, proper attitude and adequate public facilities is of prime importance.

Statistical Summary

In carrying out technical assistance and informational activities during fiscal year 1971, Department personnel assisted 2,860 communities or groups interested in business and industrial development with 4,647 industrial or business projects; participated in or conducted 7,979 meetings, workshops or conferences and carried out more than 1,000 surveys or feasibility studies. Approximately 117 man-years were devoted to this activity.

In order to reach the widest possible audience, 4,836 news articles and more than 480 fact sheets, newsletters and other materials were prepared, with a distribution of more than 295,000. Over 5,500 radio and 1,200 television broadcasts, announcements and spots were prepared.

Highlights and Examples

As a result of the leadership of Department personnel, the Hillsdale County, Michigan Redevelopment Committee was organized in July, 1970. Within a few months, with the organized involvement of over 100 community leaders and citizens, an Overall Economic Development Program was prepared. This was submitted and approved at the State and Federal levels and Hillsdale County was declared an eligible redevelopment area. The following benefits have accrued:

Industry has committed itself to build new plants and additions costing approximately $6,335,000 for land and buildings. Federal loans of $1,707,000 at a low rate of interest have already been made or committed for projects. Prior to being designated a redevelopment area the county was losing industry and jobs. One loan represented a savings of about $250,000 over the period of the loan -- making the difference between survival and closing down.

Expansion of water systems in three communities will provide needed water supplies for industrial growth. Federal grants of $417,000 and loans of $379,000 have been assured. Neither would have been possible if the county had not been designated a redevelopment area.

In the preparation of the OEDP it was estimated that 1,438 new jobs would have to be created by 1975 to provide adequate job opportunities consistent with National averages. With all these developments, about 1,000 new jobs will have been created. One thousand jobs will mean about: $3,060,000 more retail sales; $8,550,000 more State-equalized valuation for property taxes; $3,000,000 more bank deposits; and $7,200,000 more personal income.

St. Albans City in Franklin County, Vermont, lost employment opportunities when railroad shops moved out. This has been designated as a target area in which concentration on the State Rural Development Committee assistance is necessary.

To date the following steps have been taken to revitalize the area:

-- a new industry moved into St. Albans utilizing some 150 training slots implemented through the Employment Security Office.

-- a business and industrial steering committee organized.

-- coordination and focus of effort assisted by $17,000 seed money from OEO office.

-- a PL 566 watershed project revived.

-- feasibility of the combination of an existing plant and industrial park being made.

-- all state and federal agencies are assisting within the authorities of each agency's scope and responsibilities.

Since mid-1961, surveys indicate that more than 4,865 commercial, industrial, and community facilities projects have been assisted by REA borrowers. The direct jobs created in these undertakings have risen to an estimated 210,600. About 134,000 indirect jobs in related industries have followed, bringing total jobs created over 344,000.

The Colorado State Rural Development Committee was instrumental in obtaining State legislative funding support to maintain the State Meat Inspection Program, thus helping many small packing plants to stay in business.

Substantial contributions to rural development were made by university groups and extension services, such as the Industrial Extension Service at North Carolina State University. This Extension Service, consisting of faculty in the School of Engineering, works with small businesses and local industrial development groups in plant lay-out, personnel management, and in evaluating possible uses and potential products of various raw materials and natural resources in this State.

In Kentucky, the Office of Development Services and Business Research of the University of Kentucky College of Business and Economics maintains a staff of five people who provide extension assistance in management to small businesses and local governments. They work closely with Extension CRD specialists in securing clients and in followup assistance. The Division of Continuing Education and Extension of the College of Engineering provides engineering counseling to municipalities, development groups and firms. The College of Education works largely through its Bureau of School Services to assist local boards of education and other groups with studies of school systems, programs and problems, suggesting and evaluating alternative courses of action. Faculty from two divisions of the Medical Center counsel with local development groups, governments and medical groups regarding medical facilities and services.

The Center for Industrial Research and Service at Iowa State University has seven field men calling on Iowa industries. Their goal is problem-solving. Many of these problems relate to community concerns such as pollution and safety. Also, the College of Engineering provides a large amount of technical assistance, particularly in the area of water and waste. And the College of Education assists in the analysis of data relating to community schools -- size, costs, quality, etc.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT - JOB TRAINING AND EDUCATION

One of the greatest needs in rural areas is for more jobs for the people who want to live in small towns and rural areas. To obtain additional off-farm jobs for these people will require a greater effort in rural industrialization coupled with vocational-technical education and occupational training.

Agencies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, including the State Cooperative Extension Services, have been active in most States with manpower development, job training, and education programs. These activities include participation on Area and State CAMPS Committees and assistance to the development of applicable manpower training projects. Also supportive assistance has been given to vocational and technical training and community colleges and area vocational-technical schools. A few of the many activities in which USDA personnel have worked with local leadership are as follows:

-- program planning to involve all rural residents in education, training, and job development.

-- assisting in the conduct of Smaller Communities Surveys.

-- establishing Manpower Development Training Act (MDTA) training classes for various skills.

-- participating with area and State CAMPS Plans.

-- supporting the broadening of vocational and technical training through area schools.

-- organizing and assisting in the activation of Concerted Services in Training and Education (CSTE) pilot programs..

-- developing guidelines on education and training areas for off-farm type employment.

-- working with Work Incentive (WIN), Green Thumb, and other Mainstream type programs.

-- assisting in the development of Child Care Centers for working parents.

-- supporting Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) employment for school youth.

-- developing programs to train tractor drivers, woodworkers, and others in farm related skills.

-- assisting in developing training courses for employees for sewage treatment plants and other Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) type programs.

-- working with Labor Department representatives and Cooperative Extension Service in developing a plan (called Operation Hitchhike) for delivery of manpower services to rural areas.

-- working with the Department of Housing and Urban Development in Model Cities training efforts in rural areas.

-- assisting Council of Governments and Economic Development District personnel in planning effective use of manpower.

Statistical Summary

In programs with State and local leaders in the area of manpower development, job training, and education, many activities were used to achieve a balanced program (Tables 2, 3, and 4). During FY 1971, 90 man-years of USDA personnel were devoted to manpower development.

Highlights and Examples

The Forest Service and State Foresters participate by providing work training experiences to the various manpower programs under the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. Included are NYC, Operation Mainstream, and the Green Thumb Program. Forestry agencies also take part in college work-study programs and college internship programs.

One direct effort in Arizona and New Mexico which affects a number of rural communities has been organizing and training crews as fire fighters. These are Indian and Spanish-American crews trained in fire fighting control operations and widely used by the Forest Service and other agencies throughout the West. Three crews were added this year.

There are 16 CSTE pilot areas in 13 States. These pilot projects have more than twice as many participants from the rural areas in new training and education programs as there were before the pilot effort began. In one of the newer CSTE areas, a report shows that in the first year a new training program was established for (a) the repair of inboard and outboard marine engines, (b) waitresses in the new commercial recreation service activity, (c) on-the-job training for workers in a new plastics plant, (d) travel service guides or assistants in the recreation area, and (3) typists for office work. Vocational courses have been broadened to include special training in ornamental horticulture.

A Woodsworker Training Program was begun in southern Illinois last fall and completed in February, 1971. It was a cooperative effort between State and Federal agencies and the private sector. The Illinois USDA Rural Development Committee, through its agency representatives, was instrumental in planning and implementing the program.

The project proposal for the training of woodsworkers under MDTA was proposed by Federal and State agencies and representatives of timber industries. This proposal was timed so as to train unemployed and underemployed residents in cutting pulpwood which would be utilized by the $80 million Westvaco Mill at Wickliffe, Kentucky, which was nearing completion. Estimates are this market will create jobs for 70 individuals in southern Illinois.

The project proposal was approved on Nov. 1, 1970, in the amount of $16,366. Ten percent was furnished by the State,and 80 percent by the Department of Labor. Under this program the trainees were prepared to operate power saws, rubber-tired skidders, and mechanical loaders. Classroom work included contracts and simple costkeeping. The program was implemented Nov. 9 and consisted of three five-week sessions. Each session included 12 to 15 trainees. The program ended on Feb. 19, 1971. A total of 36 trainees graduated from the course. While training, each employee received an allowance of $51 per week plus $5 for each dependent, and mileage. The training program was conducted by the Division of Technical and Adult Education of Southern Illinois University. The training area was on National Forest land at the Dixon Springs Agricultural Center near Glendale, Illinois.

The project proposal for this training program was worked up through the cooperative efforts of the Illinois Division of Forestry, the Illinois State Employment Service, the Technical & Adult Education Department of Southern Illinois University, the Shawnee Resource Conservation and Development Project, the Cooperative Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Shawnee National Forest, and Westvaco.

Most of the individuals completing the course are employed, although it may not be in the timber-operating industry. This training was helpful in related occupations. Five of the individuals have gone into business for themselves in cutting pulpwood.

The Department has established a job clearing center in Pike County, Illinois.

The Florida State Rural Development Committee helped reorganize the State Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System into areas with more satisfactory groupings of population and communities with economic and social ties and then sponsored training programs for CAMPS personnel. This intensive training has enabled the area committees to work more effectively. The result should be more adequate manpower programs to meet the needs of area people.

DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL COOPERATIVES

The development of cooperatives has provided opportunities for rural people to combine their limited resources in order to obtain needed marketing facilities, supplies, machinery and equipment, storage, processing equipment, storage, processing equipment, and other services to improve their income and quality of living.

Statistical Summary

During fiscal year 1971 research, technical, and educational assistance was provided by Farmers Cooperative Service and other USDA agencies to 727 cooperative development projects throughout the country. This assistance included approximately 300 survey or feasibility studies for groups considering the establishment of new cooperatives or additional services by existing cooperatives.

In addition, 2,195 meetings, workshops, or conferences relating to cooperative development were either conducted or attended by USDA representatives.

Almost 350 new pieces of cooperative literature -- bulletins, news articles, research reports, and newsletters -- were developed during the year, and cooperatives and their members received over 70,000 copies.

There were 334 radio and television announcements and spots on cooperatives prepared for use throughout the country.

Over 47 man-years were expended in these efforts, and groups in practically every State were helped.

Highlights and Examples

Although most of the rural development cooperative work was with traditional agricultural marketing cooperatives, other types were also served, such as craft, catfish, machinery, credit, consumer, forestry recreation, and others.

These cooperatives were helped to organize, and to improve their operation once they were underway. Assistance was provided on problems such as business management, record keeping, planning, operational evaluation, market sources and structures, quality control, transportation, labor management, financing, and director and hired management training. This technical assistance was backed by basic research dealing with the unique problems of cooperatives.

A study to improve operations of cooperative cotton gins in California was designed to determine the optimum size, number and location of ginning facilities in the San Joaquin Valley. Preliminary results indicate savings possibilities in excess of $8 per bale obtainable through spatial reorganization of facilities and improved methods of handling and storing seed cotton. At $8 per bale, total cost savings to cotton producers and ginners in central California would approach $10 million annually.

Cooperative craft groups were assisted to become viable economic units by helping them with their training, accounting, management and marketing operations. A group of these cooperatives was helped to develop the Federation of Appalachian Craft Groups. The Federation will provide management, training, design and marketing assistance to about 50 associations with approximately 3,000 members in North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, and West Virginia. In doing this, the Federation will utilize funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity, craft associations and other agencies, totaling about $400,000 in FY 1972.

The South Dakota State USDA Rural Development Committee focused on the opportunity of Indians on the Pine Ridge Reservation to be trained to carry out thinning operations in the Black Hills Forest area of that State. Concerned USDA agencies cooperated to teach a group of Indians the skills necessary for such operations and provided help to form a cooperative of sufficient size operations for successful bidding on thinning contracts. The cooperative now provides employment to over 30 Indians and is helping develop their confidence as businessmen working for themselves.

Other outstanding examples of forestry cooperative development projects include: Tennessee -- technical assistance in the organization and operation of the Appalachian Forest Improvement Association; North Carolina -- dissemination of information and technical assistance to the Blue Ridge Economic Development Corporation on the organization of a timber development association; Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan--technical assistance, including analysis of resource data and preparation of a feasibility study, was provided in connection with the organization and operation of the Lake States Forestry Cooperative; and Kentucky -- technical assistance to the Grass Roots Economic Development Commission in analyzing forest resources available to Mount Top, Inc., a nonprofit wood-using corporation in that State.

The North Carolina Rural Fund for Development (NCRFD) was organized in 1968 to provide technical and loan and grant assistance to cooperatives in eastern North Carolina. The major purpose of the organization is to provide a limited technical assistance staff that is able to work with county, State, and Federal agencies in delivering financial and other resources to new cooperatives. Farmer Cooperative Service assisted in resourcing NCRFD, its organization, and establishing its objectives and purposes.

NCRFD is a nonprofit corporation that, through assistance from the State of North Carolina, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and foundations, is providing assistance that otherwise would not be available. Since the inception of its program, it has assisted approximately 25 cooperatives. These cooperatives perform such services as the marketing of vegetables, livestock, handicraft, and seafood. In addition, assistance is provided to a number of State and Federally-chartered credit unions.

NCRFD is now recognized as a major force in eastern North Carolina in rural economic development. For example, it has been able to get other agencies to provide many man years of labor to low income cooperatives that otherwise would not have been possible.

One of the cooperatives assisted is the Tri County Farmers Association at Whiteville, North Carolina. It has successfully completed its first year as a fresh vegetable marketing cooperative. Through a contract with NCRFD, the FCS has stationed a person in Whiteville to work with this 300-member cooperative. The Association is now in the process of constructing a $211,000 marketing facility.

Another example of the work of NCRFD is the Albermarle Cooperative Association, Inc., at Edenton, North Carolina. It is a feeder pig marketing cooperative that serves 11 counties. Under the contract with NCRFD, FCS has stationed a person in Edenton who is working successfully with 11 County Extension Agents and six FHA County Supervisors to train cooperative members to produce quality feeder pigs. The co-op presently has contracts with farmer-members owning 2,000 brood sows -- enough for two feeder pig sales per month of 1,000 head each.

ELECTRIC AND TELEPHONE DEVELOPMENT

Within the continental United States there are relatively few isolated areas that do not have central station electric service. Department personnel work with voluntary groups, Rural Development panels, rural electric cooperatives, private electric power companies and municipal systems to extend service to unserved areas and to improve service where required.

Telephone service is not as extensively available in rural areas as in electric service. Major Departmental efforts involve improving and extending telephone service. The main thrust of these efforts has been in upgrading multiple party line service to two-party and private line service and in extending the geographic area in which toll-free calls may be made. Thus reducing the cost to the consumer. As with electric services, personnel work with local telephone companies, cooperatives and voluntary groups to expand and improve telephone service.

Statistical Summary

The Department's rural development electric and telephone activities, over and above its normal program functions in this area are significant.

Department personnel rendered assistance to 864 communities or groups, assisted 426 specific projects, participated in or conducted 2,074 meetings, workshops or conferences and conducted over 360 surveys or feasibility studies. Over 25 man-years were devoted to this activity.

In order to reach the widest possible audience, 237 news articles and 27 fact sheets, newsletters and other materials were prepared and over 6,700 copies distributed. Over 160 radio and 22 television broadcasts, announcements and spots were prepared.

Highlights and Examples

Many Department employees have participated in discussions with electric and telephone companies and cooperatives pertaining to current activities in rural development, explaining how management, employees and consumers of these organizations can participate in planning, organizing and implementing rural development processes. Programs on public services, environmental quality, beautification, land use planning and leadership have also been emphasized.

Special efforts were exerted in Alaska where electric and telephone service is not so readily available, to assist in the Development of local government in the rural areas. A combination of Title I Funds of Higher Education Act of 1965 and matching funds was used to help residents of small rural communities understand the incorporation

process and associated leadership roles. Incorporation to a legal status was considered desirable for most communities in order to provide a basis for developing community-wide electric and telephone service.

An illustration of how successful the Department's efforts have been in transferring its expertise in economic development to the rural areas is reflected in the most recent survey of Department-financed electric and telephone systems. These systems reported that in calendar year 1970 they participated in 765 projects which created an estimated 38,570 new jobs in rural areas.

APPENDIX

This report consists of materials submitted by USDA agencies and reports from State Rural Development Committees. Copies of the individual State reports may be obtained from the Chairmen of the respective State Rural Development Committees. Ask for "(State) Rural Development Committee Report for FY 1971". See the roster of chairmen for names and addresses.

Roster

STATE USDA RURAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

ALABAMA	John A. Garrett, Director Farmers Home Administration Room 717 Aronov Building 474 Court House Street Montgomery, Alabama 36104 Tel: 205-263-7521 x 302
ALASKA	James W. Matthews, Associate Director Cooperative Extension Service University of Alaska College, Alaska 99701 Tel: 907-479-7259
ARIZONA	George E. Hull, Director Cooperative Extension Service University of Arizona Tucson, Arizona 85721 Tel: 602-884-2711
ARKANSAS	Einar L. Roget, State Conservationist Soil Conservation Service 5401 Federal Office Building Little Rock, Arkansas 72201 Tel: 501-372-5441
CALIFORNIA	George B. Alcorn, Director Cooperative Extension Service 349 University Avenue University of California Berkeley, California 94720 Tel: 415-642-7525
COLORADO	Lowell H. Watts, Director Cooperative Extension Service University of Colorado Fort Collins, Colorado 80521 Tel: 303-491-6281

0055

CONNECTICUT	George E. Whitham, Ass't Director for Programs Cooperative Extension Service University of Connecticut Storrs, Connecticut 06268 Tel: 203-429-3311 x 460
DELAWARE	Samuel M. Gwinn, Director Cooperative Extension Service University of Delaware Newark, Delaware 19711 Tel: 302-738-2504
FLORIDA	J. N. Busby, Director Agricultural Extension Service University of Florida Gainesville, Florida Tel: 904-392-1761
GEORGIA	S. E. Younts, Director Rural Development Center P. O. Box 1209 Tifton, Georgia 31794 Tel: 912-382-0460
HAWAII	Gale N. Goodell, Associate Director Cooperative Extension Service University of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii 96822 Tel: 808-944-8228
IDAHO	Howard C. Tankersley, Extension Leader Community & Resource Development Agricultural Extension Service P. O. Box 300 Boise, Idaho 83701 Tel: 208-344-5811 x 291
ILLINOIS	J. B. Claar, Director Cooperative Extension Service University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois 61801 217-333-2660

INDIANA	Howard G. Diesslin, Director Cooperative Extension Service Purdue University Lafayette, Indiana 47907 Tel: 317-749-2413
IOWA	Marvin A. Anderson, Director Cooperative Extension Service Iowa State University Ames, Iowa 50010 Tel: 515-294-4576
KANSAS	Robert A. Bohannon, Director Cooperative Extension Service Kansas State University Manhattan, Kansas 66502
KENTUCKY	John L. Ragland, Associate Director Cooperative Extension Service University of Kentucky Lexington, Kentucky 40506 Tel: 606-257-4671
LOUISIANA	John A. Cox, Director Cooperative Extension Service Louisiana State University Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803 Tel: 504-343-7444
MAINE	Edwin H. Bates, Director Cooperative Extension Service University of Maine Orono, Maine 04473 Tel: 207-866-7200
MARYLAND	R. E. Wagner, Director Cooperative Extension Service University of Maryland College Park, Maryland 20742 Tel: 301-454-3801 x 4101

MASSACHUSETTS	J. Richard Beattie, Associate Director Cooperative Extension Service University of Massachusetts Amherst, Massachusetts 01002 Tel: 413-545-2715
MICHIGAN	George S. McIntyre Cooperative Extension Service Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan 48823 Tel: 517-355-2308
MINNESOTA	R. H. Abraham, Director Agricultural Extension Service University of Minnesota St. Paul, Minnesota 55101 Tel: 612-373-1223
MISSISSIPPI	W. M. Bost, Director Cooperative Extension Service Mississippi State University State College, Mississippi 39762 Tel: 601-325-4436
MISSOURI	J. Vernon Martin, State Conservationist Soil Conservation Service P. O. Box 459 Columbia, Missouri 65201 Tel: 314-442-3141
MONTANA	Torlief S. Aasheim, Director Cooperative Extension Service Montana State University Bozeman, Montana 59715 Tel: 406-587-3121 x 271
NEBRASKA	John L. Adams, Director Cooperative Extension Service University of Nebraska Lincoln, Nebraska 68503 Tel: 404-472-7211 x 2966

NEVADA	Joseph F. Stein, Director Cooperative Extension Service University of Nevada Reno, Nevada 89507 702-784-6611
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Maynard C. Heckel, Director Cooperative Extension Service University of New Hampshire Durham, New Hampshire 03824 Tel: 603-862-1520
NEW JERSEY	John L. Gerwig, Director Cooperative Extension Service Rutgers - The State University New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903 Tel: 201-247-1766 x 1306
NEW MEXICO	Alfred E. Triviz, Associate Director Cooperative Extension Service New Mexico State University Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001 Tel: 505-646-3015 (Retired August 15, 1971. Successor to be elected)
NEW YORK	Edward H. Smith, Director Cooperative Extension Service New York State College of Agriculture Ithaca, New York 14850 Tel: 607-256-2117
NORTH CAROLINA	George Hyatt, Jr. Director Cooperative Extension Service North Carolina State University Raleigh, North Carolina 27607 Tel: 919-755-2812
NORTH DAKOTA	N. Paul Rasmusson, Director Farmers Home Administration 2nd Floor, Federal Building Third & Rosser Bismark, North Dakota 58501 Tel: 701-255-4011 x 4237

OHIO	Riley S. Dougan , Assistant Director Resource Development Ohio State University 2120 Fyffe Road Columbus, Ohio 43210 Tel: 614-293-6181
OKLAHOMA	Jean C. Evans, Director Cooperative Extension Service Oklahoma State University Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074 Tel: 405-372-6211 x 212
OREGON	Lee R. Kolmer, Director Cooperative Extension Service Oregon State University Corvallis, Oregon 97331 Tel: 503-754-2713
PENNSYLVANIA	R. M. Davis, State Conservationist Soil Conservation Service Federal Building & Court House Box 985 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101 Tel: 717-787-2297
PUERTO RICO	Enrique R. Ortiz, Director Agricultural Extension Service University of Puerto Rico Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico 00928 Tel: 809-765-8000
RHODE ISLAND	David F. Shontz, Associate Director Cooperative Extension Service University of Rhode Island Kingston, Rhode Island 02881 Tel: 401-792-2476
SOUTH CAROLINA	E. Whitson Brooks, Director Farmers Home Administration Federal Office Building 901 Sumter Street Columbia, South Carolina 29210 Tel: 803-253-8371 x 3350

SOUTH DAKOTA	John T. Stone, Director Cooperative Extension Service South Dakota State University Brookings, South Dakota 57006 Tel: 605-688-4147
TENNESSEE	William D. Bishop, Associate Dean Cooperative Extension Service Agricultural Extension Service University of Tennessee P.O Box 1071 Knoxville, Tennessee 37901 Tel: 615-974-7112
TEXAS	John E. Hutchison, Director Agricultural Extension Service Texas A & M University College Station, Texas 77843 Tel: 713-845-6411 x 40
UTAH	J. Clark Ballard, Director Cooperative Extension Service Utah State University Logan, Utah 84321 Tel: 801-752-4100 x 268
VERMONT	R. P. Davison, Director Agricultural Extension Service University of Vermont Burlington, Vermont 05401 Tel: 802-4511 x 267
VIRGINIA	W. E. Skelton, Director Cooperative Extension Service Virginia Polytechnic Institute Blacksburg, Virginia 24061 Tel: 703-845-6411 x 40
WASHINGTON	Michael C. Horan, Director Farmers Home Administration 127 S. Mission Street Wenatchee, Washington 98801 Tel: 509-663-8511 x 421

WEST VIRGINIA	B. L. Coffindaffer, Director Cooperative Extension Service University of West Virginia Morgantown, West Virginia 26506 Tel: 304-293-5691
WISCONSIN	Gale L. VandeBerg, Director Cooperative Extension Service University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin 53706 Tel: 608-262-3786
WYOMING	Robert F. Frary, Associate Director Cooperative Extension Service University of Wyoming Laramie, Wyoming 82070 Tel: 307-766-3253